| UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE | | UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov | | |
|--|-------------|---|-----------------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/723,894 | 11/26/2003 | Prathyusha K. Salla | 132958XX-C/YOD GEMS:0263 | 1160 |
| 68174 7590 09/18/2007 GE HEALTHCARE c/o FLETCHER YODER, PC | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | MEHTA, PARIKHA SOLANKI | |
| P.O. BOX 6922 Houston, T | | | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3737 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 09/18/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

٢

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-

| | | | X |
|---|---|--|---|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| Advisory Action | 10/723,894 | SALLA ET AL. | |
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Parikha S. Mehta | 3737 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap | | l. | hdrass |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>22 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS | • | • | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or this application, applicant must timely file one of the fo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complication eperiods: The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing details of the second se | on the same day as filing a filowing replies: (1) an amend Notice of Appeal (with appea ance with 37 CFR 1.114. The | Notice of Appeal. To avoid a ment, affidavit, or other evid I fee) in compliance with 37 | lence, which CFR 41.31; or (3) |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of th no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expi Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEI | re later than SIX MONTHS from or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) V | the mailing date of the final reje | ection. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The d have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office 1 may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704 NOTICE OF APPEAL | ate on which the petition under 3 f extension and the correspondin he shortened statutory period for ater than three months after the r 4(b). | g amount of the fee. The appro reply originally set in the final C mailing date of the final rejection | ppriate extension fee Office action; or (2) as n, even if timely filed, |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in co filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be fi <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | xtension thereof (37 CFR 41. | 37(e)), to avoid dismissal of | the appeal. Since |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) They raise new issues that would require further (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE b) | consideration and/or search elow); | (see NOTE below); | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling | | | ig the issues for |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR | 1.121. See attached Notice o | f Non-Compliant Amendmer | nt (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be non-allowable claim(s). | e allowable if submitted in a s | eparate, timely filed amend | ment canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): how the new or amended claims would be rejected is p The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | b) 🔲 will be entered and a | n explanation of |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: | | | - · |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| <u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of fill entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necess | to overcome all rejections une | der appeal and/or appellant | fails to provide a |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explana REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | · | |
| 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered See Continuation Sheet. | | | vance because: |
| 12. In Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s 13. In Other: | s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). | | |
| | | 15 | SL(1 |
| Poert Mach | | ST.J.S. | MAN L. CASLER |
| EXAMINER-ART (INT 3727 | | • • • | |
| | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20070904

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the Larson reference fails to disclose a sensor-based measurement system, further contending that an image-based technique does not constitute a sensor-based technique. Examiner respectfully directs Applicant's attention to the definition of the word "sensor" as set forth by Merriam Webster (http://www.m-w.com): "a device that responds to a physical stimulus (as heat, light, sound, pressure, magnetism, or a particular motion) and transmits a resulting impulse (as for measurement or operating a control)". Therefore, an image-based system does indeed constitute a sensor-based system, and the previous rejection of all pending claims is maintained accordingly. Applicant further alleges that the cited prior art fails to teach non-electrical sensors. Examiner reiterates the citation of Rogers ('144), col. 5 lines 53-63, in which the reference teaches acquiring cardiac motion data by pressure transducer, acoustic microphone, or piezoelectric crystal transducer. Since these three methods rely on acquiring the motion data in the form of a mechanical signal, they are considered non-electrical as claimed in the instant application.